

REMARKS

Status of the Application:

Claims 1–51 are the claims of record of the application. Claims 6, 9–19 and 31–35 have been withdrawn from consideration. Claims 1–5, 7, 8, 20–30 and 36–51 have been rejected.

Telephone Interview on April 24, 2006

Applicants and the undersigned appreciate Examiner's attention and courtesy during the telephone interview held April 24, 2006 between the Examiner and the undersigned. Discussed were the invention, the previous restriction requirement, and that the examiner had not considered some of the claims of the elected species. Agreement was reached during the interview that the previous office action of January 24, 2006 would be vacated, and that the Examiner would examine all claims of the species, namely claims 1–5, 7, 8, 20–30 and 36–51, and further issue a new non-final office action.

Amendment to the Claims:

Applicants have cancelled claims 1–19 and 31–51, and amended claim 20 to overcome the rejections under 35 USC 112. Applicants also have added claim 52. Claims 20–30 and 52 are the claims remaining after this amendment.

Claim Rejections -35 USC § 112 Second Paragraph (Indefiniteness)

Only the remaining claims are addressed. Claim 1 was also rejected under 35 USC § 112, but is now cancelled.

In paragraph 6 of the office action, claim 20 was rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, because, the examiner has asserted, FIGS. 7 and 9 fail to disclose “separate filters for filtering the direct response and the short time response of a room and an approximation to the reverberation response of the room” as recited in claim 20.

Applicants have amended claim 20 to recite that said filter system includes “one or more filters to account for the direct response of a room and one or more filters to account for an approximation to the reverberant response of the room, the filter system including feedback response filtering for producing said feedback inputs, such that the filtered intermediate output signals include filtered direct response signals and filtered reverberant signals.”

Applicants also have added claim 52 dependent on amended claim 20 to recite “wherein said one or more filters to account for the direct response also account for the short time echo response of the room.

The examiner's rejection under 35 USC 112, second paragraph is believed overcome.

Claim Rejections -35 USC § 102 and 35 USC § 103

In paragraph 9 of the office action, claims 1–5, 7, 8, 37, 40, 44, 47 and 49–51 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cashion et al (US 5,809,149A) in view of Davis et al (US 6,449,368).

Purely in the interest of progressing prosecution, these claims are now cancelled.

Allowable Subject Matter

In paragraph 12 of the office action, the examiner stated that claims 20–30 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action.

Applicants have indeed so amended claim 20, and added claim 52 to be dependent on amended claim 20.

The remaining claims 20–30 and 52 have thus been deemed by the examiner to be allowable.

For these reasons, and in view of the above amendment, this application is now considered to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner has any questions or comments that would advance the prosecution and allowance of this application, an email message to the undersigned at dov@inventek.com, or a telephone call to the undersigned at +1-510-547-3378 is requested.

Respectfully Submitted,

October 10, 2006
Date

/Dov Rosenfeld/ #38687
Dov Rosenfeld, Reg. No. 38687

Address for correspondence:

Dov Rosenfeld
5507 College Avenue, Suite 2,
Oakland, CA 94618
Tel. 510-547-3378
Fax: +1-510-291-2985
Email: dov@inventek.com